



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,420	07/08/2003	Ronald Hegli	WEBSN.013C1	1267
20995 7590 12/21/2009 KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614				
EXAMINER BLAIR, DOUGLAS B				
ART UNIT 2442		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 12/21/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com  
eOAPilot@kmob.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/616,420

**Applicant(s)**

HEGLI ET AL.

**Examiner**

DOUGLAS B. BLAIR

**Art Unit**

2442

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 11/17/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the cited portions of Freund, Freund clearly shows limiting a user's amount of time accessing a network. Freund also clearly suggests that some categories of content are more objectionable than others. Freund does not explicitly tie the two concepts together. Bedard shows that the idea of limiting the amount of time that a user views certain types of content was well known. Stern shows that the same concepts can be applied to various types of media including web pages and television programming. There is not bit of disclosure provided by the applicant and covered by the claims that is not made obvious in view of these teachings.

The applicant's arguments against the combination of Freund and Bedard are flawed for two reasons.

First, in Freund, though there is a central supervisor, the filtering is able to be implemented completely at the client. The applicant's arguments about an unworkable premise are not supported by the disclosure of Freund.

Second, the applicant's claims are broadly directed towards on the concept of limiting access to categories but are broad enough to cover client based implementations, centrally based implementations, and any combination thereof. Freund and Bedard are only relied upon to show the broad concepts that the applicant is claiming and therefore the details on how each invention may be implemented are irrelevant given the broad nature of the claim. Though the applicant's

specification may discuss a more centralized concept, the applicant's claims are not limited by this disclosure.

In Summary, the applicant is claiming a broad concept that was shown to be obvious at the time of the invention by the applied references. The Examiner sees no subject matter claimed by the applicant that puts in the public in possession of any knowledge that was not already evident at the time of the invention. As shown in the rejection limiting based on categories is not a patentable distinction.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,987,611 to Freund et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,801,747 to Bedard and in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,486,892 to Stern.

As to claim 1, Freund teaches a method of controlling user access to Internet sites, comprising: determining an Internet site that a user is accessing; providing a timer; incrementing said timer with time spent accessing Internet site by said user and blocking said user from accessing the Internet site when said timer reaches a predetermined level (Figure 7A and col. 9, line 64-col. 10, line 43); however Freund does not explicitly teach limiting based on a content

category of Internet sites. Freund does suggest that it may be beneficial to limit the access to certain types of content (col. 9, lines 38-41).

Bedard teaches a method of monitoring including a profile that can be used to control the amount of time that information can be accessed for a particular category of content (col. 7, line 65-col. 8, line 6, in this case television).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Freund regarding limiting the amount of time a user can spend on an internet site with the teachings of Bedard regarding monitoring time access to content categories because content categories would allow a user of Freund's system to more broadly characterize rules instead of having to type each website in manually as shown in Figure 7A of Freund. Also, Stern shows the use of the same profile and rules for managing both internet content and television content (such as that explicitly monitored in Bedard) and how the teachings from either type of content can apply to one another, especially in the context of the applicant's broadly claimed invention (See Summary and corresponding disclosure in Stern).

As to claims 2 and 3, Freund allows a user to pick any arbitrary amount of time (Figure 7A).

As to claims 4 and 5, Freund shows that the time limit can be in effect for one day (Figure 7A).

As to claim 6, a second rule can be plugged into Figure 7A of Freund for a second content category.

As to claim 7, Freund teaches logging activities (col. 9, lines 17-19).

As to claim 8, Freund does not state that the Freund invention applies to cached webpages. Therefore a user of the Freund-Bedard-Stern combination would not be restricted from cached web pages as is conventionally known.

As to claims 19 and 20, they are directed towards a system for implementing the method of claims 1 and 8 and are therefore rejected for the same reasoning as claims 1 and 8.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOUGLAS B. BLAIR whose telephone number is (571)272-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Douglas B Blair/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2442